COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED EMENDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS TO CAVOLINIA OF CAVOLINA ABILDGAARD, 1791. Z.N.(S.) 1103 (see present volume, pages 45-47)

By David Heppell (Dept. of Zoology, The University, Glasgow, Scotland)

As the generic names Cavolina Bruguière and Cavolina Abildgaard, published in the same year, were both based on the modern patronymic "Cavolini," one might consider the spelling "Cavolina" to have been an incorrect original spelling in both cases, requiring automatic correction wherever found. According to Article 32(c) such a name does not enter into homonymy, so Dr. Lemche's proposal to suppress the generic name Cavolina Bruguière for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy would seem to be justified, to prevent any subsequent validation of the name by another author. "Cavolinia Menke, 1845" was not a separate name but a justified emendation by Menke of Cavolina Bruguière and, as such, takes the date and authorship of the original spelling [Article 33(a)]. Thus we have, according to the Code, not only Cavolinia Abildgaard, 1791, but also Cavolinia Bruguière, 1791. This anomaly could be obviated by giving a grant of precedence under the plenary powers in favour of Cavolinia Abildgaard. The name to be applied to the nudibranch genus after suppression of Cavolinia Bruguière will be discussed in my comment on Z.N.(S.) 1105 below.

In conclusion, in accordance with what is written above, I should like to recommend that the International Commission approve the following of Dr. Lemche's proposals in the present application: (2); (3); (4); (5) (b), (d) and (e). I beg leave to lay the following alternative proposals before the Commission in place of the others:

- (1) to use the plenary powers to grant precedence to the generic name *Cavolinia* Abildgaard, 1791 (correction of *Cavolina*), over the generic name *Cavolinia* Bruguière, 1791 (correction of *Cavolina*);
- (2) to place the generic name Cavolinia Bruguière, 1791 (correction of Cavolina), (a junior homonym of Cavolinia Abildgaard, 1791, according to the ruling given under the plenary powers in (1) above), on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology.

If these alternatives are adopted, proposals (1) (a) and (b), and (5) (f) of Dr. Lemche's application will no longer be required, while his proposals (5) (a), (c) and (6) should be emended to delete references to the use of the plenary powers.

By Myra Keen (Stanford University, California, U.S.A.)

Studying the several proposals submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (B.Z.N. 21, pts. 1-2, Mar.-Apr. 1964) relatively to names in the Opisthobranchia, I find myself in agreement with all but one. Favourable action would seem to be in the interests of stability of nomenclature. However, on Z.N.(S.) 1103 (pp. 45-47), relative to the pteropod name Cavolina, I feel that more is to be said for retaining the spelling Cavolina of Abildgaard. I cannot agree with the statement that most authors since 1847 have accepted Gray's alteration. Making a census of check lists and systematic papers, taken at random from the library shelves, I find that of 16 works citing the genus—these all having appeared since 1850—11 use the spelling Cavolina and 5 Cavolinia. To stabilize the name as Cavolina would have the further advantage that this is in harmony with the indicated priority in two principal nomenclators—Sherborn's Index Animalium, where Cavolina Abildgaard, 1791, is cited in Part C of the section 1801–1850, having been omitted in the earlier volume; and Neave's Nomenclator generum et subgenerum. I therefore feel that emendation to Cavolinia is not in the interests of stability.